

ROMA-1395/00
 SHEP 01/10
 hep-lat/0104006

$K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ Decays in a Finite Volume

C.-J.D. Lin^a, G. Martinelli^b, C.T. Sachrajda^a and M. Testa^b

^a*Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of Southampton,
 Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK*

^b*Dip. di Fisica, Univ. di Roma "La Sapienza" and INFN, Sezione di Roma,
 Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Rome, Italy*

Abstract

We discuss finite-volume computations of two-body hadronic decays below the inelastic threshold (e.g. $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays). The relation between finite-volume matrix elements and physical amplitudes, recently derived by Lellouch and Lüscher, is extended to all elastic states under the inelastic threshold. We present a detailed comparison of our approach with that of Lellouch and Lüscher and discuss the possible limitations of the method which could arise due to the presence of inelastic thresholds. We also examine a standard alternative method which can be used to extract the real part of the decay amplitude from correlators of the form $\langle 0 | T[\pi\pi\mathcal{H}_W K] | 0 \rangle$. We show that in this case there are finite-volume corrections which vanish as inverse powers of the volume, which cannot be removed by a multiplicative factor.

1 Introduction

The theory of non-leptonic weak decays represents a major challenge for particle physicists because of our inability to control the strong interaction effects. Lattice QCD offers a natural opportunity to compute the corresponding matrix elements from first principles. A number of theoretical questions however, needs to be answered before such computations can be performed with sufficient precision to be phenomenologically relevant. The main difficulties are related to the continuum limit of the regularized theory (the *ultra-violet* problem) and to the relation between matrix elements computed in a finite Euclidean space-time volume and the corresponding physical amplitudes (the *infrared* problem). The ultra-violet problem, which deals with the construction of finite matrix elements of renormalized operators constructed from the bare lattice ones, has been addressed in a series of papers [1]-[3] and we will not consider it further in this work. The infrared problem arises from two sources:

- the unavoidable continuation of the theory to Euclidean space-time and
- the use of a finite volume in numerical simulations.

An important step towards the solution of the infrared problem has recently been achieved by Lellouch and Lüscher [4] (denoted in the following by LL), who derived a relation between the $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ matrix elements in a finite volume and the physical kaon-decay amplitudes. This relation is valid up to exponentially vanishing finite-volume effects.

In this paper we present an alternative discussion of boundary effects and the LL-formula, based on a study of the properties of correlators of local s-wave operators ¹ We derive LL-formulae for all elastic states under the inelastic threshold, with exponential accuracy in the quantization volume. A consequence of our derivation is that the relation between finite-volume matrix elements and physical amplitudes, derived by Lellouch and Lüscher for the lowest seven energy eigenstates can be extended to all elastic states under the inelastic threshold. Our analysis also demonstrates explicitly how finite volume correlators converge to the corresponding ones in infinite volume.

Our approach is based on the property of correlators of local operators which can be expressed, with exponential accuracy, both as a sum or as an integral over intermediate states, when considering volumes larger than the interaction radius and Euclidean times $0 < t \simeq L$. A possible source of concern is therefore the (practically relevant) situation in which the quantization volume allows only very few (perhaps two or three) elastic states under the inelastic threshold. In this case we will show that it is not possible, in general, to derive the LL-formula from the behaviour of correlators of local operators. At first sight this may appear to be a weakness of our approach compared to that of ref. [4]. We will

¹s-wave operators are those which, when applied to the vacuum in a finite volume, excite only states with an s-wave component. They include the finite-volume restriction of all infinite-volume rotationally invariant local operators.

argue however, that the validity of the Lüscher quantization condition for the energy levels of two-particle states in a finite volume [5] also requires the volume to be sufficiently large for the Fourier series to be equal to the infinite-volume energy integrals, up to exponential corrections. Since the derivation of the LL relation in ref. [4] relies on this quantization formula, we conclude that the conditions on the volume for the applicability of this relation are equivalent in the two approaches. This issue is of considerable practical significance. For the foreseeable future, in actual lattice simulations of $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays there will be very few elastic states below the inelastic threshold, E_{th} (perhaps even only two such states). It is therefore necessary to examine the precision with which the integral over the energy is approximated by the sum over the elastic finite-volume energy levels below E_{th} . In this paper we discuss this question theoretically.

In spite of the limitations discussed in the previous paragraph, we will argue that for an important class of dynamical situations the proximity of the kinematic inelastic threshold does not necessarily invalidate the LL-relation and that these situations are likely to include the two-pion system in physical kaon decays. A more quantitative answer will have to await results from detailed numerical simulations in the future. The number of states below E_{th} can be changed by varying either the masses of the mesons in a given volume (and hence considering unphysical decays) or the size of the volume. Thus one has the opportunity of investigating the importance of finite-volume corrections in exclusive two-body decays quantitatively.

Another important consequence of our approach is the demonstration that it is possible to extract $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitudes also when the kaon mass, m_K , is not equal to the two-pion energy, i.e. when the inserted weak Hamiltonian operator carries a non-zero energy-momentum. Such amplitudes may be useful, for example, in the determination of the coefficients of the operators appearing in the chiral expansion.

We also examine an alternative method often used to obtain information about $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decay amplitudes. This method is based on the evaluation of the correlation function $\langle 0 | \pi_{\vec{q}}(t_1) \pi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) \mathcal{H}_W(0) K(t_K) | 0 \rangle$, where $\pi_{\vec{q}}(t)$ denotes the three dimensional Fourier transform of the pion's interpolating field $\pi(x)$ ². Taking the times $t_{1,2}$ to be large and positive with $t_1 \gg t_2$ and t_K to be large and negative, we obtain the real part of the physical $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decay amplitude (see below), up to power corrections in the volume. These power corrections cannot be removed by multiplication by the LL-factor.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In sec. 2 we start by recalling some basic facts about infinite-volume Euclidean Green functions related to kaon decays. In particular, we stress the result derived in ref. [6] that in Euclidean space one obtains the average of the matrix elements into *in* and *out* two-pion states. We expand the discussion of the similarities and differences between the Euclidean- and Minkowski-space calculations

²In the introduction we denote by K and π interpolating fields with the quantum numbers of these particles. In subsequent sections we reserve K and π to denote the corresponding particles and introduce a different notation for the interpolating fields.

in appendix A, where we demonstrate how the physical $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitude (for which the two-pion state is an *out* state) is recovered in Minkowski space.

We then proceed to discuss calculations in a finite volume. In section 3 we present a heuristic discussion concerning correlators in a three dimensional periodic cubic volume. In sec. 4 the finite volume formulae are derived and a detailed comparison of our approach with that of ref. [4] is presented. In this section we also examine the conditions on the volume required for our derivation and in sec. 5 we analyze those needed for the Lüscher quantization formula [5].

In sec. 6 we present an alternative method to obtain information about the kaon decay amplitude, based on the correlator $\langle 0 | \pi_{\vec{q}}(t_1) \pi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) \mathcal{H}_W(0) K(t_K) | 0 \rangle$ introduced above. We show that in this case there are power corrections in the volume and explain why they are not removable by the LL correcting factor. We present our conclusions in section 7.

There are three further appendices, introduced to clarify the discussion. In appendix B we demonstrate that it is indeed $\Re\{\mathcal{A}\}$ which is obtained from the $\langle 0 | T[\pi\pi\mathcal{H}_W K] | 0 \rangle$ correlator ($\Re\{\mathcal{A}\}$ represents the real part of A). In Appendix C we sketch the derivation of the Lüscher quantization formula and some basic facts needed in the text. In appendix D we demonstrate that it is possible to determine the scattering phase δ directly by computing four-pion correlation functions.

2 Euclidean Green Functions and Physical Amplitudes

One of the main obstacles in the extraction of physical amplitudes from lattice simulations stems from the rescattering of final state particles in Euclidean space. The formalization of this problem, in the infinite-volume case, was considered in ref. [6] and is referred to as the *Maiani-Testa no-go theorem*. In this section we review the arguments leading to this theorem, elucidating the main differences between the Euclidean and Minkowski formulations of the theory. This allows us to fix the notation and to introduce several quantities which will be used in the following. The discussion of finite-volume effects is postponed to the following sections.

We are ultimately interested in $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays. Single particle states however, do not present any theoretical difficulty so, following ref. [6], in order to simplify the discussion while retaining the essential physical aspects, we eliminate the kaon and consider the Green function

$$\mathcal{G}(t_1, t_2; \vec{q}) = \langle 0 | \Phi_{\vec{q}}(t_1) \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) J(0) | 0 \rangle , \quad (1)$$

where $t_1 > t_2 > 0$; J is a local operator which can create two-pion states with a definite

isospin, from the vacuum;

$$\Phi_{\vec{q}}(t) \equiv \int d^3x e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \phi(\vec{x}, t), \quad (2)$$

and $\phi(\vec{x}, t)$ is some appropriately chosen interpolating operator for the pion. For convenience the two-pion intermediate state is chosen to have total momentum equal to zero. From the continuation of the correlation function (1) to Minkowski space, using LSZ reduction formulae one can determine the form factor

$${}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (3)$$

which we assume to be the goal of some numerical simulation. In order to avoid unnecessary kinematical complications, in the following we discuss the case of a Hermitian, local, scalar operator J , which excites zero angular-momentum states from the vacuum. The extension of the present discussion to correlators relevant for $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays is completely straightforward.

In practice, in a numerical simulation the Euclidean correlation functions can be computed only approximately and so the continuation to Minkowski space is impossible. We therefore have the problem of extracting the relevant physical information from the Euclidean correlation functions.

The general expression of eq. (1) in terms of matrix elements was derived in ref. [6]. For $t_1 \gg t_2 > 0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(t_1, t_2; \vec{q}) = & \frac{Z}{(2E_q)^2} e^{-E_q(t_1+t_2)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[{}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle + {}_{\text{in}}\langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right] \right. \\ & \left. + 2E_q \mathcal{P}_{\vec{q}}(t_2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_{\vec{q}}(t_2) \equiv \mathcal{P} \sum_n \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(0) | n \rangle_{\text{out}}^{\text{conn}} {}_{\text{out}}\langle n | J(0) | 0 \rangle e^{-(E_n - 2E_q)t_2}, \quad (5)$$

$$E_q = \sqrt{\vec{q}^2 + m_\pi^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{Z} = \langle 0 | \phi(\vec{0}, 0) | \pi(\vec{q}) \rangle. \quad (6)$$

$\sqrt{Z}$ and E_q can be obtained by computing the propagator of a single pion. We use the normalization $\langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \pi(\vec{p}) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 2E_q \delta^3(\vec{q} - \vec{p})$. $\mathcal{P}$ represents the principal value of the integral implicit in the $\sum_n$ and the superscript “conn” implies that the corresponding matrix element is the connected one. Although the term in square brackets in eq. (4) is real and hence cannot be equal to the form factor in eq. (3), it is nevertheless a physical quantity which can be directly compared with experiment. To see this it is convenient to write

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \langle J \rangle & \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[{}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle + {}_{\text{in}}\langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right] \\ & = \left| {}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right| \cos \delta(2E_q), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\delta(2E_q)$ is the FSI phase shift for the two pions. Here and in the following we assume that the two-pion energy is below the inelastic threshold. Unfortunately, the extraction of $\Re\langle J \rangle$ from the correlation function at large time distances is impossible in practice, since in this limit it is exponentially dominated by the last term in eq. (4). The conclusion of ref. [6] was therefore that it is only possible to extract the form factor $\langle \pi(\vec{0})\pi(\vec{0})|J|0 \rangle$, with the two pions both at rest.

The continuation of eq. (4) to Minkowski space is obtained by replacing $t \rightarrow it$ in the time-dependent exponentials. At finite times therefore, the average in eq. (7) also appears in the Minkowski space version of eq. (4). However, as shown in Appendix A, at asymptotically large time distances t_2 :

$$2E_q \mathcal{P}_{\vec{q}}(t_2) \xrightarrow{t_2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{out} \langle \pi(\vec{q})\pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle - \text{in} \langle \pi(\vec{q})\pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right] \quad (8)$$

so that the terms in braces in eq. (4) combine to give the physical amplitude (including its imaginary part). In Euclidean space this is not the case.

3 Finite-Volume vs Infinite-Volume Calculations: Three-Dimensional Case

As pointed out in sec. 2, knowledge of $\Re\langle J \rangle$ together with the phase shift δ , is sufficient to reconstruct the physical amplitude. In infinite-volume the energy spectrum is continuous and the isolation and determination of $\Re\langle J \rangle$ turns out to be impossible. In a finite volume on the other hand, energy levels are discrete and the extraction of $\Re\langle J \rangle$ is possible in principle, provided that we are able to control the preasymptotic behaviour of the relevant correlation function at large time distances [7].

We start this section by recalling the basic properties of the energy levels of two-particle elastic states in a cubic periodic box [5]. In order to help clarify the arguments made later in this paper, a derivation of the relevant results is given in Appendix C.

In a finite cubic volume, $V = L^3$ (where L is the length of each spatial direction), the allowed values of the “radial” relative momentum, k , of a two-particle cubically invariant state with total momentum zero and with a non-zero s-wave component, satisfy the condition

$$h(W, L) = n, \quad (9)$$

where n is a non-negative integer ³ and

$$h(W, L) \equiv \frac{\phi(q) + \delta(k)}{\pi}. \quad (10)$$

In eq. (10) $\delta(k)$ is the infinite-volume s-wave phase shift, $q \equiv kL/2\pi$, and k is related to the center of mass energy W by

$$W = 2\sqrt{m_\pi^2 + k^2}. \quad (11)$$

The function $\phi(q)$ is defined by

$$\tan \phi(q) = -\frac{\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} q}{Z_{00}(1; q^2)}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$Z_{00}(s; q^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \sum_{\vec{l} \in Z^3} (\vec{l}^2 - q^2)^{-s}. \quad (13)$$

In the following we will denote the energies (11) corresponding to each value of n by E_n . Eq. (9) is derived under the simplifying assumption of an angular momentum cutoff: here and below we therefore ignore the contribution to eq. (9) from states of higher angular momenta. These could be included without difficulty in our discussion. Moreover we will consider δ as a function of the total energy or of k , whichever will be more convenient.

The spectrum of cubically invariant two-pion states with total momentum zero is not exhausted by the solutions of eq. (9). There are states which correspond to $q = |\vec{l}| = |\vec{l}'|$ such that $\vec{l}$ and $\vec{l}' \in Z^3$ and are not related by a cubic rotation [5]. It is shown in Appendix C that these additional states do not have an s-wave component, in contrast to those given by eq. (9).

Although the energy levels are those corresponding to a finite volume V , $\delta(k)$ in eq. (10) is the *infinite*-volume phase shift. The derivation of this equation [5], described in Appendix C, requires that V is larger than the two pion interaction region. In particular, in Appendix C it is shown that eq. (9) is equivalent to the condition that there is no distortion of the s-wave component of the two-pion wave function due to boundary conditions. We denote these wave functions by $\Psi_{E_n}^{(V)}(\vec{x})$, where $\vec{x}$ is the relative position of the two pions.

Our strategy is based on the analysis of correlators of local observables which admit two pions as intermediate states. For simplicity we take the two pions to have total momentum zero. We consider local observables which are rotationally invariant in infinite volume. As discussed in section 4, this amounts to selecting the contribution of the s-wave component of the state $\Psi_{E_n}^{(V)}(\vec{x})$ to the matrix element $\langle 0|J(0)|E_n\rangle$.

³ For $n = 0$, there are two solutions: one corresponding to $k = 0$ which is spurious, the other giving the Lüscher relation between the finite volume energy and the scattering length [5].

In order to establish the relation between the finite and infinite-volume amplitudes, it is convenient to consider the two-point correlation function:

$$\mathcal{C}(t) \equiv \int_V d^3x \langle 0 | J(\vec{x}, t) J(0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (14)$$

and its behaviour as the volume V becomes large. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_V d^3x \langle 0 | J(\vec{x}, t) J(0) | 0 \rangle_V &\xrightarrow{V \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(2\pi)^3}{2(2\pi)^6} \int \frac{d^3p_1}{2E_1} \frac{d^3p_2}{2E_2} \delta(\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2) e^{-(E_1+E_2)t} \times \\ &\quad | \langle 0 | J(0) | \pi(\vec{p}_1) \pi(\vec{p}_2) \rangle |^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3} \int dE e^{-Et} |\langle 0 | J(0) | \pi\pi, E \rangle|^2 \int \frac{d^3p_1}{2E_1} \frac{d^3p_2}{2E_2} \delta(\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2) \delta(E - E_1 - E_2) \quad (15) \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dE}{E} e^{-Et} |\langle 0 | J(0) | \pi\pi, E \rangle|^2 k(E), \end{aligned}$$

where $E_{1,2} = \sqrt{p_{1,2}^2 + m^2}$ and

$$k(E) = \sqrt{\frac{E^2}{4} - m_\pi^2}. \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, in a finite, but asymptotically large, volume we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_V d^3x \langle 0 | J(\vec{x}, t) J(0) | 0 \rangle_V &= V \sum_n |\langle 0 | J(0) | \pi\pi, n \rangle_V|^2 e^{-E_n t} \quad (17) \\ &\xrightarrow{V \rightarrow \infty} V \int_0^\infty dE \rho_V(E) |\langle 0 | J(0) | \pi\pi, E \rangle_V|^2 e^{-Et}. \end{aligned}$$

In eq. (17), $|\pi\pi, n\rangle_V$ and $|\pi\pi, E\rangle_V$ denote the finite-volume two-pion states at fixed n and fixed energy E , respectively. $|\pi\pi, n\rangle_V$ are classified according to the quantum number n defined in eq. (9). $\rho_V(E)$ denotes a function to be determined, which provides the correspondence between finite volume sums and infinite volume integrals. In many cases, for example in one dimension, $\rho_V(E)$ can be identified as the density of states at energy E . In section 4, after a discussion of the constraints imposed by the locality of $J(x)$, we show that, also in the presence of cubic boundary conditions, $\rho_V(E)$ is given by,

$$\rho_V(E) = \frac{dn}{dE} = \frac{q\phi'(q) + k\delta'(k)}{4\pi k^2} E, \quad (18)$$

with exponential precision in the volume. The expression in eq. (18) is the one which one would heuristically derive from a naïve interpretation of $\rho_V(E)$ as the density of states, cf.

eq. (9). There are however, some technical subtleties with such an interpretation which will be discussed later in this section.

Comparing eqs. (15) and (17), we establish the correspondence

$$|\pi\pi, E\rangle \Leftrightarrow 4\pi \sqrt{\frac{VE\rho_V(E)}{k(E)}} |\pi\pi, E\rangle_V. \quad (19)$$

Similarly, by considering correlators of operators which excite single particle states, we find

$$|\vec{p}=0\rangle \Leftrightarrow \sqrt{2mV} |\vec{p}=0\rangle_V. \quad (20)$$

From eqs. (19) and (20) we readily obtain the amplitudes of the effective weak Hamiltonian in terms of the corresponding finite-volume matrix elements:

$$|\langle\pi\pi, E|\mathcal{H}_W(0)|K\rangle|^2 = 32\pi^2 V^2 \frac{\rho_V(E)Em_K}{k(E)} |{}_V\langle\pi\pi, E|\mathcal{H}_W(0)|K\rangle_V|^2. \quad (21)$$

In order to obtain the physical amplitude we set $E = m_K$ in the above equation and find

$$|\langle\pi\pi, E = m_K|\mathcal{H}_W(0)|K\rangle|^2 = 8\pi V^2 \{q\phi'(q) + k\delta'(k)\}_{k=k_\pi} \left(\frac{m_K}{k_\pi}\right)^3 |{}_V\langle\pi\pi, E|\mathcal{H}_W(0)|K\rangle_V|^2 \quad (22)$$

where

$$k_\pi \equiv \sqrt{\frac{m_K^2}{4} - m_\pi^2}. \quad (23)$$

Eq. (22) is the same as the formula derived by Lellouch and Lüscher [4]. The additional factor of V^2 on the r.h.s. of eq. (22) is present because we have used the Hamiltonian density rather than the Hamiltonian. We stress that the relation (21) is valid for the matrix elements of any local operator with any momentum transfer (below the inelastic threshold) and hence the matching condition $m_K = E$ is not required. Although eq. (22) appears to be equivalent to the corresponding equation in ref. [4] there is an important difference in the two derivations. The result of ref. [4] was obtained at a fixed value of n and at a fixed volume V , tuned to have $m_K = E_n$, with $n < 8$. Eq. (21), on the other hand, has been derived at fixed energy E for asymptotically large volumes V . This implies that as $V \rightarrow \infty$ we must simultaneously allow $n \rightarrow \infty$. A question which arises naturally at this point is what is the relation between the two approaches? The answer requires a more detailed discussion, developed in the following section, where it will be shown that the constraints of locality allow us to establish eq. (18) with exponential accuracy for elastic states under the inelastic threshold.

We end this section with a discussion of the subtleties mentioned above, concerning a rigorous interpretation of $\rho_V(E)$ as a density of states. For purposes of illustration we

discuss the issues of completeness, normalization and degeneracy for the free theory. In this case the eigenfunctions are plane waves and we write the completeness relation directly in the subsector of zero total momentum

$$\sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{e^{i\vec{p}_n \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{y})}}{V} = \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \quad \vec{x}, \vec{y} \in V, \quad (24)$$

where, as above, $\vec{x}$ denotes the relative position of the two particles. Since we will consider the insertion of this completeness relation between local, rotationally invariant operators, the only relevant component of the plane waves is their s-wave projection:

$$\psi_{p_n}(r) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \int_{\Omega} \frac{d\Omega}{4\pi} e^{i\vec{p}_n \cdot \vec{x}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \frac{\sin p_n r}{p_n r}, \quad (25)$$

with $p_n \equiv |\vec{p}_n|$. The component of the completeness relation which is equivalent to the identity when inserted between s-wave operators reads

$$\sum_{\{E_n\}} \nu_n \psi_{p_n}(r) \psi_{p_n}(r') = \mathcal{I}_s, \quad (26)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_s$ is the s-wave projection of the identity ($\delta(\vec{x} - \vec{y})$ appearing in eq. (24)) and ν_n denotes the number of plane waves with the same p_n , i.e. the same energy. The sum over states in eq. (26) is now a sum over the different energy values E_n rather than over the different momenta as was the case in eq. (24).

Eq. (26) shows that the factor ν_n should not be considered as a degeneracy in the s-wave projection (it corresponds always to the same wave function); it should instead be viewed as a normalization factor. Thus the correctly normalized s-wave functions, when considering the completeness relation between rotationally invariant states, are

$$f_{p_n}(r) = \sqrt{\nu_n} \psi_{p_n}(r) = \sqrt{\frac{\nu_n}{V}} \frac{\sin p_n r}{p_n r}. \quad (27)$$

It is now straightforward to deduce the relation between the finite volume s-wave function, $f_{p_n}(r)$ and the corresponding wave function in infinite volume:

$$\psi_p^{(\infty)}(r) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int_{\Omega} \frac{d\Omega}{4\pi} e^{i\vec{p} \cdot \vec{x}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \frac{\sin pr}{pr}. \quad (28)$$

The relation is obtained by comparing eqs. (27) and (28):

$$\psi_{p_n}^{(\infty)}(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_n}} \sqrt{\frac{V}{(2\pi)^3}} f_{p_n}(r). \quad (29)$$

Recall that ν_n in eq. (26) is the number of different ways in which a given $\vec{n}^2$ can be realized using vectors with integer components. For large n , ν_n is rapidly and irregularly varying with n and therefore the presence of a factor of ν_n poses a difficulty to a rigorous interpretation of dn/dE as the density of states⁴. However, what actually happens is that, whereas both factors $\rho_V(E)$ and $|\langle 0|J(0)|\pi\pi, E\rangle_V|^2$ in eq. (17) are rapidly varying with energy, their product has a smooth behaviour. This can be seen by a computation of the correlator of a rotationally invariant observable, such as $:\phi^2(x):$ (where ϕ is a scalar field). For $J(x) = :\phi^2(x):$ eq. (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_V d^3x \langle 0 | : \phi^2(x) : : \phi^2(0) : | 0 \rangle_V = \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \int_V d^3x \sum_{\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2} |\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 \rangle_V|^2 e^{i(\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2) \cdot \vec{x}} e^{-(E_{p_1} + E_{p_2})t} \\
& = \frac{V}{2} \sum_{\vec{p}} \left| \langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | \vec{p}, -\vec{p} \rangle_V \right|^2 e^{-2E_p t} \\
& = V \sum_n |\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | n \rangle_V|^2 e^{-E_n t} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{E_n} \frac{2}{E_n^2} \nu_n e^{-E_n t} \\
& \xrightarrow{V \rightarrow \infty} V \int_0^\infty dE \rho_V(E) |\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | n \rangle_V|^2 e^{-Et} .
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

In eq. (30) we have used the free-field result

$$|\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | \vec{p}, -\vec{p} \rangle_V| = \frac{2}{VE_n} , \tag{31}$$

so that

$$|\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | n \rangle|^2 = \frac{2}{V^2 E_n^2} \nu_n . \tag{32}$$

Therefore the correspondence in eq. (19) is given in the free theory by

$$|\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 \rangle|^2 = |\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | n \rangle|^2 E_n^2 \frac{\phi'(n)}{2\pi^2 n^2} V^2 . \tag{33}$$

In deriving eq. (33) we have used the fact that in the free case the spectrum of states, and hence the solution of eq. (9), is given by

$$q^2 = \left(\frac{Lk}{2\pi} \right)^2 = n^2 . \tag{34}$$

⁴We acknowledge many discussions on this point with L. Lellouch and M. Lüscher.

It is easy to demonstrate that

$$\phi'(n) = \frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{\nu_n} , \quad (35)$$

and hence that

$$\left| \langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | \vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2 \rangle \right|^2 = 4 , \quad (36)$$

which is the correct result for the free-field theory with covariant normalization in infinite volume.

Following this discussion, the last line of eq. (30) is equal to

$$V \int_0^\infty dE \rho_V(E) |\langle 0 | : \phi^2(0) : | n \rangle_V|^2 e^{-Et} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{2m}^\infty dE \frac{k(E)}{E} e^{-Et} \quad (37)$$

in perfect agreement with the infinite volume expression.

This example shows that, in the free case, the meaning of the LL factor is very simple. It removes the degeneracy factor (ν_n) due to the fact that we extract from the correlator the contribution of the n^{th} energy level and restores the appropriate factors to normalize the states in the infinite volume limit correctly.

4 How large is a *large volume*?

In this section we study finite-volume effects in a toy mathematical example as well as in non-relativistic quantum mechanics and relativistic field theory. The common feature and key ingredient in all these cases is the locality of the operators whose matrix elements are being computed. Within our approach we will be able to show that, in the quantum mechanical case, the LL formula is true for all levels containing an s-wave component, up to exponentially small corrections in the volume. This conclusion is compatible with a stronger unpublished result by Lüscher [8], who finds that the LL relation is indeed *exactly* valid for the same levels. The discussion given in ref. [8], however, is specific to non-relativistic quantum mechanics and cannot be readily generalized to relativistic quantum field theory.

In relativistic field theory the situation is more complicated for two basic reasons. Firstly, the interaction range is not precisely defined, so that all results are valid at most with exponential precision. The second and more substantial difficulty comes from the presence of inelastic production, which, as shown in sec. 5 below, could also affect the validity of the quantization condition in eq. (9).

For the discussion below, it will be useful to recall the general relation between a discrete sum and the corresponding integral, which follows from the Poisson formula [9]

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x - n) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i2\pi nx} . \quad (38)$$

Multiplying both sides of eq. (38) by a function $f(x)$ and integrating over x , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} f(n) &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) e^{2\pi i n x} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) dx + \sum_{n \neq 0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) e^{2\pi i n x} dx . \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Eq. (39) shows that an integral is equal to a discrete sum up to correction terms, given by the sum over terms with $n \neq 0$. In the following we will show how to control these corrections in order to make contact with the LL formula.

4.1 A Toy Example

Consider the simple one-dimensional example of a C^∞ -function, $f(x)$, vanishing with all its derivatives outside a compact support which is entirely contained inside the “finite volume” $-L/2 < x < L/2$. This is the statement of locality in our toy model. $f(x)$ can be expanded as a Fourier series:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_n \tilde{f}(p_n) e^{ip_n x} , \quad (40)$$

where

$$p_n \equiv \frac{2\pi}{L} n \quad (41)$$

and

$$\tilde{f}(p) \equiv \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} dx f(x) e^{-ipx} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx f(x) e^{-ipx} . \quad (42)$$

On the other hand, $f(x)$ can also be written as a Fourier transform

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dp \tilde{f}(p) e^{ipx} . \quad (43)$$

Whereas eq. (43) reproduces $f(x)$ exactly, eq. (40) coincides with $f(x)$ only in the interval $-L/2 < x < L/2$; outside this interval $f(x)$ is replicated periodically on the x -axis. If we now consider a second function $g(x)$ with the same properties as $f(x)$, we have:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx g^*(x) f(x) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_n \tilde{g}^*(p_n) \tilde{f}(p_n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dp \tilde{g}^*(p) \tilde{f}(p). \quad (44)$$

Eq. (44) is an example of the exact equality between an integral and a discrete sum without any correction terms. It shows that, for local observables, the “finite volume correlator” $\frac{1}{L} \sum_n \tilde{g}^*(p_n) \tilde{f}(p_n)$ is exactly equal to the “infinite volume correlator” $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dp \tilde{g}^*(p) \tilde{f}(p)$, as long as the support of the observables is entirely contained inside the “quantization volume” L . In the next section we will show how to derive similar relations to the LL-formula from equations such as (44).

4.2 Finite-Volume Effects in Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics

We now extend the previous considerations to the case of a quantum system, starting with the non-relativistic quantum mechanical case. In preparation for the relativistic case presented below, we use the formalism of second quantization also in the quantum mechanical case and introduce interpolating operators $\phi^\dagger(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\phi(\vec{x}, t)$ that respectively create and annihilate the physical particles. Consider two “local”, zero angular-momentum two-particle operators $\mathcal{R}(\vec{X}, t)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\vec{X}, t)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{R}(\vec{X}, t) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x R(r) \phi^\dagger \left(\vec{X} + \frac{\vec{x}}{2}, t \right) \phi^\dagger \left(\vec{X} - \frac{\vec{x}}{2}, t \right), \quad \text{where } r \equiv |\vec{x}|, \quad (45)$$

with a similar definition for $\mathcal{S}(\vec{X}, t)$. The functions $R(r)$ and $S(r)$ defined in eq. (45) have support contained inside V , thus ensuring locality. Under this hypothesis, we now show that the matrix elements of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ in the finite volume V are proportional to those in the infinite volume, with a constant of proportionality given precisely by the LL-factor.

Consider the zero momentum two-point function

$$\mathcal{G}_V(t) \equiv \int_V d^3X \langle 0 | \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{X}, t) \mathcal{R}(\vec{0}, 0) | 0 \rangle. \quad (46)$$

At $t = 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{G}_V(0) = \int_V d^3x S(r) R(r) = \int d^3x S(r) R(r) = \mathcal{G}_\infty(0), \quad (47)$$

where the second equality comes from the hypothesis that $S(r)$ and $R(r)$ have support only in V . Eq. (47) shows that we can analyze $\mathcal{G}_V(0)$ both in terms of finite volume and infinite

volume intermediate states. Inserting a set of complete states in the infinite volume we have

$$\mathcal{G}_\infty(0) = \int_{\bar{E}}^\infty dE s^*(E) r(E) \quad (48)$$

where $\bar{E}$ is the lowest energy in the $\pi\pi$ channel, $\bar{E} = 0$ or $2m_\pi$ in the nonrelativistic and relativistic cases respectively and, for example,

$$s^*(E) = \int d^3x S(r) \Psi_E^{(s\text{-wave})}(r). \quad (49)$$

In eq. (49) we have denoted by $\Psi_E^{(s\text{-wave})}(r)$ the center of mass, zero-angular momentum wave function of two pions with energy E .

We now turn to the correlation function in a finite volume, and insert a complete set of energy eigenstates:

$$\mathcal{G}_V(0) = V \sum_n \langle 0 | \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0) | n \rangle \langle n | \mathcal{R}(\vec{0}, 0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (50)$$

where $|n\rangle$ denote the energy eigenstates with zero total momentum and with the normalization $\langle n | n' \rangle = \delta_{n,n'}$. Since the local operators under consideration depend only on r , the sum in eq. (50) receives contributions only from the zero angular momentum component of the intermediate states. In other words we have, for example

$$\langle 0 | \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0) | n \rangle = \int_V d^3x S(r) \Psi_{E_n}^{(V)}(\vec{x}) \propto s^*(E_n). \quad (51)$$

As shown in Appendix C, the states $|n\rangle$ are precisely those described by eq. (9). We may therefore rewrite eq. (50) as

$$\mathcal{G}_V(0) = V \sum_n s^*(E_n) r(E_n) c_V(E_n), \quad (52)$$

with a set of non-negative coefficients $c_V(E_n)$, in terms of which we have

$$|s(E_n)|^2 = \frac{1}{c_V(E_n)} |\langle 0 | \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0) | n \rangle|^2. \quad (53)$$

It is our aim to evaluate the coefficients $c_V(E_n)$ and to demonstrate that eq. (53) is precisely the LL-relation.

The previous discussion shows that at $t = 0$ the correlation function $\mathcal{G}_V(0)$ defined in eq. (46) coincides with the corresponding one in the infinite-volume limit, without any corrections. We now investigate what happens at a generic value of t . In this case we get

$$\mathcal{G}_V(t) = V \sum_n \langle 0 | \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0) | n \rangle \langle n | \mathcal{R}(\vec{0}, 0) | 0 \rangle e^{-E_n t} = \int_V d^3x S(r, t) R(r) \quad (54)$$

where

$$S(r, t) \equiv e^{-Ht} S(r), \quad (55)$$

with a similar result for $R(r, t)$. In eq. (55) H denotes the first quantization, center of mass Hamiltonian (differential) operator acting on two-particle wave functions, whose eigenvalues are precisely the $\{E_n\}$. From eq. (55) it follows that $S(r, 0) = S(r)$ and $R(r, 0) = R(r)$.

The key point for the identity of finite and infinite volume correlators at $t = 0$, as seen from eq. (47), is the locality of $S(r)$ and $R(r)$. On the other hand, for a generic t , eq. (55) shows that $S(r, t)$ is obtained from $S(r)$ through a diffusion process. It is well known that, even if $S(r)$ has a compact support, $S(r, t)$ will be non-zero over the entire infinite volume for $t \neq 0$. In general, therefore

$$\mathcal{G}_V(t) \neq \mathcal{G}_\infty(t). \quad (56)$$

However, diffusion is a “slow” process, and for a range of $t \approx L$ we still have

$$\mathcal{G}_V(t) = \mathcal{G}_\infty(t) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-m_\pi L}), \quad (57)$$

while for $t > m_\pi L^2$ we expect $\mathcal{G}_V(t)$ to be very different from $\mathcal{G}_\infty(t)$. Eq. (57) implies that, with exponential accuracy in the volume,

$$V \sum_n s^*(E_n) r(E_n) c_V(E_n) e^{-E_n t} = \int_{\bar{E}}^\infty dE s^*(E) r(E) e^{-Et}. \quad (58)$$

We can now use eq. (38) to transform the r.h.s. of eq. (58) back into a sum again. Eq. (38) implies that

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(h(E, L) - n) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i2\pi n h(E, L)}, \quad (59)$$

where $h(E, L)$ is defined in eq. (10).

Combining eqs. (58) and (59) we obtain

$$\int_{\bar{E}}^\infty dE s^*(E) r(E) e^{-Et} = \sum_n \frac{s^*(E_n) r(E_n) e^{-E_n t}}{\left| \frac{\partial h(E, L)}{\partial E} \right|_{E_n}} - \mathcal{Q}(L, t), \quad (60)$$

where the observable $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ have been chosen to vanish sufficiently rapidly in $\bar{E}$ to avoid problems with the spurious solution with $k = 0$ (see below). In eq. (60), we have introduced

$$\mathcal{Q}(L, t) \equiv \sum_{l \neq 0} \int_{\bar{E}}^\infty dE s^*(E) r(E) e^{-Et} e^{i2\pi l h(E, L)} \quad (61)$$

and used the fact that the energies are non-negative.

A general property of any quantization condition is that for fixed E

$$h(E, L) \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} \infty . \quad (62)$$

In our case, with cubic boundary conditions, we have

$$h(E, L) \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} L k(E) . \quad (63)$$

Eq. (62) is a statement that as the volume is increased, the value of n corresponding to any fixed energy also increases.

For $n = 0$, a possible complication may arise due to the spurious solution with $k = 0$. This can be easily avoided however, since it is possible to choose local operators for which the threshold behaviour of $s^*(E)r(E)$ can be made to vanish arbitrarily quickly. This can be achieved by taking appropriate combinations of local observables and their time derivatives and recalling that any time derivative multiplies the matrix element by the energy according to

$$\langle 0 | \dot{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0) | n \rangle = i \langle 0 | [H, \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0)] | n \rangle = -iE \langle 0 | \mathcal{S}^\dagger(\vec{0}, 0) | n \rangle . \quad (64)$$

Using the techniques of asymptotic analysis [10], and taking into account eq. (62), we deduce that the behaviour of the correction term $\mathcal{Q}(L, t)$ at large L is dominated by the critical points of $h(E, L)$, i.e. the points at which $h(E, L)$ has a vanishing derivative or the points where $h(E, L)$ and $s^*(E)r(E)$ are not continuous or differentiable. In the present case the only critical point of $h(E, L)$ occurs at threshold, i.e. for $k \approx 0$. This means that the behaviour of $\mathcal{Q}(L, t)$ at large L is power-like, with the power determined by the threshold behaviour of $s^*(E)r(E)e^{-Et}$. These power corrections depend on the time as $e^{-\bar{E}t} \sim e^{-2m_\pi t}$ (multiplied by powers of t). They therefore only affect matrix elements computed at energies close to threshold. Indeed, as discussed above, by an appropriate choice of local observables it is possible to make the product $s^*(E)r(E)$ at threshold arbitrarily small and consequently to make the leading power in the $1/L$ expansion in $\mathcal{Q}$ arbitrarily high. Thus

$$V \sum_n s^*(E_n)r(E_n)c_V(E_n)e^{-E_nt} = \sum_n \frac{s^*(E_n)r(E_n)e^{-E_nt}}{\left| \frac{\partial h(E, L)}{\partial E} \right|_{E_n}} - \mathcal{Q}(L, t) , \quad (65)$$

and since we are interested in amplitudes at fixed energy E (between $\bar{E}$ and the inelastic threshold), in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have, with exponential accuracy,

$$c_V(E_n) = \frac{1}{V \left| \frac{\partial h(E, L)}{\partial E} \right|_{E_n}} \quad (66)$$

for all states with energies above $\bar{E}$. Eqs. (53) and (66), together with the kinematic factors appropriate to the chosen normalization, establish the LL-type relations of the kind given in eq. (21), with exponential accuracy.

We conclude this subsection with some brief remarks about the matrix element with the two-pion state at threshold. A priori, the threshold matrix element can be affected by power corrections, although our derivation does not necessarily imply that this is the case, since we are unable to control the sum over l in eq. (61). Threshold states are generally problematic and require a separate discussion. For example, in the case of an attractive potential, their energy in a finite volume is lower than $\bar{E}$. We are not able therefore, to derive a relation between the finite-volume matrix element at threshold and the corresponding infinite-volume amplitude which we can demonstrate is free of corrections which vanish as inverse powers of the volume.

4.3 Finite-Volume Effects in Relativistic Quantum Field Theory

In relativistic quantum field theory (RQFT) the previous considerations must be modified since strict localization of the support is not possible and therefore the state

$$|J\rangle \equiv J(0)|0\rangle \quad (67)$$

is only approximately localized around the origin. The probability of finding particles at a distance r away from the origin never vanishes, although, as a consequence of clustering, it decreases exponentially like $e^{-m_\pi r}$ [11]. There is a further point that needs to be considered. The correlator appearing in eq. (47) is evaluated at equal times. In field theory such an equal-time correlator is generally UV divergent, due to the short distance singularities in the product of two local operators. A natural regulator for such divergences is the (Euclidean) time. The discussion of the quantum mechanical case can then be generalized to field theory. We therefore conclude that the equality

$$\mathcal{G}_V(t) = \mathcal{G}_\infty(t) \quad (68)$$

is also valid in RQFT with exponential accuracy.

For correlators of local operators, the most important difference from the non-relativistic quantum mechanical case is due to the existence of the inelastic threshold, E_{th} . This implies that in any fixed finite volume, there are only a limited number of elastic states with energies below E_{th} . Therefore the truncated sum over the E_n (truncated at E_{th}) reproduces the corresponding integral (cut-off at the same energy) only up to corrections which vanish as $L \rightarrow \infty$. However, the number of such states increases with the volume and the arguments presented in section 4.2 can readily be generalized to the RQFT. In particular we conclude that eq. (66) is still valid with exponential accuracy. Our derivation of the LL formula demonstrates that, in principle, it is possible to improve the precision by working at fixed energy on increasing volumes (and hence increasing n).

The discussion above does not imply, however, that the corrections are small for any volume. In order for these corrections to be really negligible, we must work in volumes which are sufficiently large that the sum over energies is well approximated by the corresponding integral. It is of course impossible to give an estimate of the error on the LL formula in lattice simulations when the volume is such that there are only a few elastic states ($2 \div 3$) below E_{th} . We will argue in the next section that in such cases there are related difficulties in the derivation of the quantization condition (9).

5 Quantization of Two-Particle Energy Levels in Quantum Field Theory

In this section, we re-examine the quantization condition given in eq. (9) within the framework of Relativistic Quantum Field Theory (RQFT). Although eq. (9) has been discussed in detail in the quantum mechanical case, and its extension to RQFT can also be found in ref. [5], to our knowledge the explicit, non-perturbative treatment given below is new. This discussion helps to clarify what happens when only few elastic levels exist below E_{th} .

The concept of a wave function in RQFT is an approximate one. In this case, the object closest to a wave function is the Bethe-Salpeter (BS) wave function. We discuss the infinite-volume case first. For an incoming state with total momentum zero, the BS wave function is defined as

$$\Phi_{\vec{p}}(x) = \langle 0 | T[\phi(\vec{x}, t) \phi(0)] | \pi(\vec{p}) \pi(-\vec{p}) \rangle_{\text{in}} . \quad (69)$$

For simplicity we present our discussion for $t = 0$ ⁵. We now derive the relation between $\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) \equiv \Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}, 0)$ and the scattering phase shifts in the infinite-volume limit. We introduce a complete set of intermediate states⁶

$$\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) = \sum_n \langle 0 | \phi(\vec{x}, 0) | n \rangle \langle n | \phi(0) | \pi(\vec{p}) \pi(-\vec{p}) \rangle_{\text{in}} \quad (70)$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3q}{2E_q} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \phi(0) | \pi(\vec{p}) \pi(-\vec{p}) \rangle_{\text{in}} e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}} + \mathcal{I}(\vec{x}) , \quad (71)$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\vec{x})$ represents the contribution coming from inelastic intermediate states with more than one particle. We separate the connected and disconnected contributions to eq. (71) in the standard way:

$$\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) = Z e^{i\vec{p} \cdot \vec{x}} + \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3q}{2E_q} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \phi(0) | \pi(\vec{p}) \pi(-\vec{p}) \rangle_{\text{in}}^{\text{conn}} e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}} + \mathcal{I}(\vec{x}) . \quad (72)$$

⁵There are no ultraviolet problems, even if $\phi(x)$ is a composite field (as is the case in QCD) because we always choose $\vec{x} \neq \vec{0}$.

⁶In order to simplify the presentation we will treat the particles as distinguishable.

Using

$$\langle \vec{q} | \phi(0) | \pi(\vec{p}) \pi(-\vec{p}) \rangle_{\text{in}}^{\text{conn}} = -\frac{\sqrt{Z} \mathcal{M}}{q^2 - m_\pi^2 + i\varepsilon} = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{4E_p} \frac{\mathcal{M}}{E_q - E_p - i\varepsilon} , \quad (73)$$

we obtain

$$\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) = Z \left(e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3q}{2E_q} \frac{\mathcal{M}}{4E_p(E_q - E_p - i\varepsilon)} e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \right) + \mathcal{I}(\vec{x}) . \quad (74)$$

For large values of $\vec{x}$ the inelastic contribution can be safely neglected. Moreover, in eq. (74), the integral over $\vec{q}$ is dominated by the on-shell contribution ($E_q \approx E_p$), for which $\mathcal{M}$ becomes the physical on-shell amplitude $\mathcal{M}(\vec{p} \rightarrow \vec{q})$. Indeed $\mathcal{M}$ has no singularities for $2E_p$ below the inelastic threshold. To simplify the discussion, we consider a situation in which all the phase shifts except the s-wave one (denoted by $\delta(p)$) are negligible. Under this hypothesis we have

$$\mathcal{M}(\vec{p} \rightarrow \vec{q}) = \frac{4\pi}{i} \frac{2E_p}{p} (e^{2i\delta(p)} - 1) . \quad (75)$$

From eq. (74), we then get

$$\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) = Z \left(e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} + \frac{1}{2i} (e^{2i\delta(p)} - 1) \frac{e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}}}{pr} \right) + \dots . \quad (76)$$

Using the asymptotic behaviour of the s-wave projection of $e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}}$

$$e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}}|_{s\text{-wave}} \sim \frac{\sin pr}{pr} + \dots , \quad (77)$$

we finally arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x})|_{s\text{-wave}} &= \frac{Z}{pr} \left(\sin pr + \frac{1}{2i} (e^{2i\delta(p)} - 1) e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \right) \\ &= \frac{Ze^{i\delta(p)}}{pr} \sin(\delta(p) + pr) + \dots . \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

We are now in a position to discuss the quantization of energy levels in a finite volume. For our purposes it is sufficient to consider the simple case of a spherical finite volume of radius R with vanishing fields on the boundary ⁷. For sufficiently large R , the asymptotic expression in eq. (78) to hold, we obtain the quantization condition

$$n\pi - \delta(p) = pr , \quad (79)$$

⁷We return to consider the quantization condition in a cubic volume in some detail in Appendix C below.

which is the analog of eq. (9) (which was derived for a cube) on a spherical volume.

The central question for our discussion is whether the quantization condition in eq. (79) holds when the volume is so small that only a few levels exist below E_{th} . In such a situation we show that in general it is not possible to follow the steps that lead from eq. (72) to (79) from which the quantization condition is obtained.

As previously discussed, the validity of the Lüscher quantization condition requires (the s-wave projection of) $\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x})$ to be undeformed by the presence of the boundary. This implies that, up to terms which vanish exponentially with the volume, it is the same function of $\vec{x}$ (for $\vec{x}\epsilon V$) when expressed as a sum over either the finite or the infinite-volume energy eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) &= Z \left(e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} + \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3 2E_q} \frac{\mathcal{M}}{4E_p(E_q - E_p - i\varepsilon)} e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \right) + \mathcal{I}(\vec{x}) \\ &= \sum_n \langle 0|\phi(0)|n\rangle \langle n|\phi(0)|\pi(\vec{p})\pi(-\vec{p})\rangle_{\text{in}} e^{i\vec{q}_n\cdot\vec{x}},\end{aligned}\tag{80}$$

where $\vec{q}_n$ are the 3-momenta appropriate to the given boundary conditions.

Both the δ -function and the principal part of the pole at $E_q = E_p$ in eq. (74) are essential to obtain eq. (76); they separately contribute to both the outgoing and incoming waves and it is only in their sum that the principal part cancels the incoming wave and doubles the outgoing one. It follows that the scattered wave is purely outgoing, as expected. We remind the reader that for this derivation of the quantization condition to be valid it is necessary to work at distances such that the integral is dominated by energies $E_q \simeq E_p$, so that the variation of $\mathcal{M}$ with the energy can be neglected. Thus a necessary condition for the validity of the quantization formula in a finite volume is that the same situation is reproduced by the discrete sum in eq. (80). Strictly speaking, in a fixed volume, it is not possible to separate the connected and disconnected terms and to parametrize the amplitude as in eq. (73), because no energy poles can be present in this case. These contributions and, in particular, the principal part of the integral in (74) must be well approximated by the sum over those elastic states for which we may neglect the variation of $\mathcal{M}$. Therefore, for the validity of eq. (79), the sum over n in eq. (80) must be dominated by its elastic part. On the other hand, we expect that, even restricting the sum to one-particle intermediate states ($|n\rangle = |\vec{q}_n\rangle$), the matrix element $\langle \vec{q}_n|\phi(0)|\pi(\vec{p})\pi(-\vec{p})\rangle_{\text{in}}$ receives important contributions from the inelastic states when $E_n > E_{th}$. This happens because there is no reason for the off-shell amplitude $\langle n|\phi(0)|\pi(\vec{p})\pi(-\vec{p})\rangle_{\text{in}}$ to be dominated by the one particle term. We conclude, therefore, that in the case where only a few levels have energies below E_{th} , the sum over the finite-volume eigenstates cannot, in general, be dominated by the elastic contribution, and we should expect corrections to eq. (79).

An equivalent way of arriving at the same conclusion is to write the Schrödinger-like

eigenvalue equation which is satisfied by $\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x})$, namely

$$(m_\pi^2 - \nabla^2 - E_p^2) \Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x}) = \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3 2E_q} \mathcal{M} e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} + \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) \equiv \mathcal{K}_{el}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}), \quad (81)$$

where $\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) = (m_\pi^2 - \nabla^2 - E_p^2) \mathcal{I}(\vec{x})$. In the non-relativistic case the r.h.s. of eq. (81) is simply $V(\vec{x})\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x})$ and is therefore well localized, as discussed in the previous section. In the field theoretical case, $\mathcal{K}_{el}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{K}(\vec{x})$ is an exponentially localized function in $\vec{x}$, since it is the Fourier transform of a regular function. The differential operator $(m_\pi^2 - \nabla^2 - E_p^2)$ applied to $\Phi_{\vec{p}}(\vec{x})$ filters out the long distance contribution from the disconnected and pole terms, leaving only the short range contribution. Thus, for the quantization condition to be valid $\mathcal{K}_{el}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{K}(\vec{x})$ must be completely localized inside the quantization volume. Once again this is true if and only if $\mathcal{K}_{el}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{K}(\vec{x})$ is the same function, when expressed as a Fourier integral or a Fourier series. However, while in the infinite-volume case there is a substantial contribution to $\mathcal{K}_{el}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{K}(\vec{x})$ coming from elastic states with energies below E_{th} , in a finite volume this contribution is limited to a sum over a few (perhaps even as few as two or three) elastic states and the Fourier series and integral cannot be expected to be identical. It is true that, in the sum over intermediate states, we still have an infinite sum due to the contribution of all the states above E_{th} , however, in cases in which inelasticity is important, this contribution is qualitatively different from the ones below E_{th} .

We end this section by noting that there is a favourable dynamical situation in which the quantization conditions (9) (and (79)) remain valid and the LL correction formula is applicable even on volumes with only a few states below E_{th} . This is the case for weakly interacting particles, for which inelastic contributions are negligible at the energy of interest. Such a dynamical situation is effectively the same as in quantum mechanics, where it is sufficient for the interaction region to be only slightly smaller than the quantization volume. From phenomenological studies it is likely that such a situation describes, to a good approximation, the low energy dynamics of pions [12].

6 Evaluation of the amplitudes: a different method

In this section we analyze a different way to obtain weak $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitudes in finite-volume simulations, one that is more closely related to the discussion in ref. [6] and section 2. The method, which is currently used in numerical simulations, requires the evaluation of four-point correlation functions of the form $\langle 0 | \pi_{\vec{q}}(t_1) \pi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) \mathcal{H}_W(0) K(t_K) | 0 \rangle$, where the times $t_{1,2}$ are large and positive with $t_1 \gg t_2$ and t_K is large and negative. We will show that from this correlation function one obtains directly the real part of the decay amplitude, up to corrections which vanish as inverse powers of the volume and which cannot be removed by a multiplicative correction factor. The connection of this calculation with the LL approach will be explained.

Since single-particle states do not present any theoretical complications, we proceed as in section 2, eliminating the kaon and considering the correlation function $\mathcal{G}$ defined in eq. (1). When $t_1 \rightarrow \infty$, eq. (1) can be conveniently written as

$$\mathcal{G}(t_1, t_2; \vec{q}) \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-E_q t_1} \mathcal{G}_3(t_2, \vec{q}), \quad (82)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) \equiv \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(t) J(0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (83)$$

for $t > 0$. From eqs. (4)–(7) we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-E_q t} \left|_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right| \cos \delta(2E_q) + \dots, \quad (84)$$

where the ellipses represent the principal value term defined in eq. (5). We remind the reader that the above equations are valid in infinite volume.

If we could isolate the term proportional to $\exp(-E_q t)$ in the correlation function $\mathcal{G}_3$, we would obtain $\left|_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right| \cos \delta(2E_q)$. This can be achieved by working in a finite volume in the following way. Considerations similar to those in section 4 give

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) = \sqrt{2E_q V} \sum_n A_V(E_n) e^{-(E_n - E_q)t} \xrightarrow[V \rightarrow \infty]{} \int_{2m_\pi}^{\infty} dE A_\infty(E) e^{-(E - E_q)t}, \quad (85)$$

where the finite-volume spectral function A_V is defined as

$$A_V(E_n) \equiv {}_V \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}} | \pi\pi, n \rangle_V {}_V \langle \pi\pi, n | J(0) | 0 \rangle. \quad (86)$$

Eq. (84) allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{2m_\pi}^{\infty} dE A_\infty(E) e^{-(E - E_q)t} = \\ \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-E_q t} \left|_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right| \cos \delta(2E_q) + \int_{2m_\pi}^{\infty} dE A_\infty^{P.V.}(E) e^{-(E - E_q)t}, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

where $P.V.$ denotes the contribution coming from the principal value of the integral. Using the Poisson summation formula in eq. (38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) \xrightarrow[V \rightarrow \infty]{} & \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-(E_{\vec{n}} - E_q)t} \left|_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right| \cos \delta(2E_q) \\ & + \sum_n \frac{A_\infty^{P.V.}(E)}{\rho_V(E_n)} e^{-(E_n - E_q)t} + O\left(\frac{1}{L}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where $E_{\tilde{n}}$ is the closest approximation to $2E_q$ among the solutions of eq. (9). The replacement of $2E_q$ by $E_{\tilde{n}}$, at fixed t , is valid up to power corrections in the volume. Due to the presence of ρ_V in the denominator, each term in the sum in eq. (88) vanishes at large volumes (as inverse powers of the volume). Thus, from a numerical evaluation of $\mathcal{G}$ we obtain

$$A_V(E_{\tilde{n}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E_q V}} \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} \Big|_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \Big| \cos \delta(2E_q) , \quad (89)$$

up to power corrections in the volume. Eq. (89) was suggested in ref. [7], under a smoothness assumption on the amplitudes.

We end this section by explaining that the conclusion of the preceeding paragraphs is consistent with the results of ref. [4] and the discussion in the previous sections. Consider eq. (86). From the final-state interaction theorem, we deduce that the phases of the two factors are equal and opposite so that the right-hand side is equal to the product of the absolute values. By an additional measurement of the four-pion correlation function (see, for example, Appendix D), we can obtain $|_V \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}} | \pi\pi, n \rangle_V|$, and hence determine $|_V \langle \pi\pi, n | J(0) | 0 \rangle|$. Correcting this finite-volume matrix element by the LL-factor we determine the infinite-volume matrix element up to exponentially small corrections. This is not the procedure which was followed in arriving at the real part of the matrix element in eq. (89) however, and this explains the different precision of the two cases.

7 Conclusions

In this paper we have discussed the conditions under which the amplitudes of two-body decays below the inelastic threshold, such as $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays, can be computed in a finite volume. We have shown that the correction factor recently found by Lellouch and Lüscher [4], which relates the finite-volume matrix elements and the physical (infinite-volume) decay amplitudes at zero momentum transfer for finite volume states up to $n = 7$, can be extended, with exponential precision in the volume, to all elastic states under the inelastic threshold and to any momentum transfer.

We have examined the possible influence of inelastic thresholds both on these correction factors and on the quantization condition for two-particle states (below the inelastic threshold) in a finite volume. Our conclusion is that, in general, the presence of inelastic thresholds requires us to work on sufficiently large volumes so that the sum over elastic states under the inelastic threshold can be approximated reliably by the corresponding integral over the energy. In lattice simulations in the foreseeable future the fulfillment of this condition will represent a formidable challenge. It is therefore reassuring that in hadronic sectors, such as the two-pion system in $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays, where the interaction is rather weak and inelasticity develops fully only at energies significantly higher than the kinematic thresholds,

the finite-volume approach may be applicable starting from relatively small volumes. The quantitative implications for lattice computations of $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decay amplitudes will need to be investigated in numerical simulations.

We have also examined a different and frequently used method to obtain the real part of the $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitude based on the correlator $\langle 0 | T[\pi\pi\mathcal{H}_W K] | 0 \rangle$. We find that in this case there are finite-volume corrections, which vanish only as inverse powers of the volume, and we have explained the connection with the approach of ref. [4].

Nonleptonic weak decays will continue to play a central rôle in particle physics phenomenology in the coming years. We trust that this paper is a contribution to the theoretical framework which will underpin lattice simulations of $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays. Further work is needed in order to understand how to treat contributions from states above the inelastic threshold, particularly in relation to nonleptonic two-body B -decays. For this important class of processes a huge amount of experimental data is becoming available and yet its interpretation is currently limited by our inability to quantify the strong interaction effects.

Acknowledgements

We warmly thank Laurent Lellouch and Martin Lüscher for many helpful discussions throughout the course of this work. We gratefully acknowledge interesting discussions with our colleagues from the EU network on Hadron Phenomenology, and especially with Peter Hasenfratz and Ferenc Niedermeyer.

This work was supported by European Union grant HTRN-CT-2000-00145. DL and CTS acknowledge support from PPARC through grants PPA/G/S/1997/00191, PPA/G/O/-1998/00525 and PPA/G/S/1998/00529.

Appendix A

In this appendix we show that $\mathcal{G}(t, \vec{q})$, defined in eq. (1), is equal to the expression given in eq. (4) also in Minkowski space. We will see that although the right-hand side of eq. (4) contains the average of the matrix elements into *in* and *out* two-pion states, the term containing the principal value integral is precisely that required to recover the full physical amplitude in Minkowski space, but not in Euclidean space. The aim of this discussion is to clarify the similarities and differences between the Euclidean and Minkowski correlation functions.

We start by inserting a complete set of *out*-states $\{|m\rangle\}$ ⁸ in $\mathcal{G}_3$, defined in eq. (83), and

⁸ As before we restrict our discussion to two-pion intermediate states.

obtain

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) = \sum_m (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\vec{p}_m) e^{-i(E_m - E_q)t} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(0) | m \rangle \langle m | J(0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (90)$$

where $\vec{p}_m$ is the momentum of the two-pion state labeled by m .

The disconnected contribution to G_3 is readily obtained using

$$\langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(0) | \pi(\vec{k}) \pi(-\vec{k}) \rangle_{\text{out}}^{\text{disc}} = 2E_q (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\vec{q} - \vec{k}) \sqrt{Z}, \quad (91)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{G}_3^{\text{disc}}(t, \vec{q}) = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-iE_q t} {}_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle. \quad (92)$$

To evaluate the connected contribution we use the reduction formula

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{\text{out}} \langle m | \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) \rangle_{\text{in}} &= 2E_2 {}_{\text{out}} \langle m - \pi(q_2) | \pi(q_1) \rangle_{\text{in}} \\ &+ \frac{i}{\sqrt{Z}} (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_m - q_1 - q_2) (-p^2 + m_\pi^2) {}_{\text{out}} \langle m | \phi(0) | q_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

where temporarily we introduce general momenta q_1 and q_2 . $\langle m - \pi(q_2) |$ represents the state containing the particles in state $\langle m |$ with $\pi(q_2)$ removed. This contribution is absent if $\langle m |$ does not contain such a pion. The scattering amplitude $\mathcal{M}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2; m)$ is defined from the limit as $p = (E_m - E_1, \vec{q}_2)$ goes on-shell, $p^2 \rightarrow m_\pi^2$,

$$\langle \pi(\vec{q}_1) | \phi(0) | m \rangle_{\text{out}}^{\text{conn}} = \sqrt{Z} \frac{\mathcal{M}^*}{-p^2 + m_\pi^2 + i\varepsilon} = -\sqrt{Z} \frac{\mathcal{M}^*}{(p_0 - E_2 - i\varepsilon)(p_0 + E_2 + i\varepsilon)}. \quad (94)$$

The physical scattering amplitude for $\pi(q_1) + \pi(q_2) \rightarrow m$ is therefore given by

$$(2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_m - q_1 - q_2) (i\mathcal{M}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2; m)) = {}_{\text{out}} \langle m | \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) \rangle_{\text{in}} - {}_{\text{out}} \langle m | \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) \rangle_{\text{out}}, \quad (95)$$

where we have used the fact that single-particle *in* and *out* states are the same.

We now use

$$\frac{1}{p_0 - E_2 - i\varepsilon} = i\pi \delta(p_0 - E_2) + \mathcal{P} \frac{1}{p_0 - E_2}, \quad (96)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ stands for “principal value”, to write

$$\langle \pi(\vec{q}_1) | \phi(0) | m \rangle_{\text{out}}^{\text{conn}} = -i\pi \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_2} \mathcal{M}^* - \frac{\sqrt{Z} \mathcal{M}^*}{p_0 + E_2 + i\varepsilon} \mathcal{P} \frac{1}{p_0 - E_2}. \quad (97)$$

The first term on the r.h.s. of (97) gives a contribution to $\mathcal{G}_3$ of

$$\mathcal{G}_3^{\text{conn},A} = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_2} e^{-iE_2 t_2} \times \frac{1}{2} \left[{}_{\text{in}} \langle \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) | J(0) | 0 \rangle - {}_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right], \quad (98)$$

which, when combined with the disconnected term gives

$$\mathcal{G}_3^{\text{disc}} + \mathcal{G}_3^{\text{conn},A} = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_2} e^{-iE_2 t_2} \times \frac{1}{2} \left[{}_{\text{in}} \langle \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) | J(0) | 0 \rangle + {}_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(q_1) \pi(q_2) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right]. \quad (99)$$

Thus we see that *even in Minkowski space* we get the average of the matrix elements into *in* and *out*-states. The remaining contribution to $\mathcal{G}_3$ comes from the principal value term in (97).

In Minkowski space however, writing the result in the form of (4) is not very transparent. To recover the standard result recall that $\mathcal{G}_3$ contains a factor of $\exp(-iE_m t)$ and that

$$\langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(0) | m \rangle_{\text{out}}^{\text{conn}} = -\frac{\sqrt{Z} \mathcal{M}^*}{p^2 - m_\pi^2 - i\varepsilon} = -\frac{\sqrt{Z} \mathcal{M}^*}{E_m(E_m - 2E_q - i\varepsilon)}. \quad (100)$$

The sum over the intermediate states can be written as an integral over E_m . As $t \rightarrow \infty$ this integral, which is sufficiently convergent, can be extended to the range $(-\infty, \infty)$ and evaluated by contour integration. For positive t we can close the contour in the lower half-plane and, since there are no singularities there, we obtain zero for the connected contribution. In this way we obtain the standard result

$$\mathcal{G}^{\text{Minkowski}}(t_1, t_2; \vec{q}) = \frac{Z}{(2E_q)^2} e^{-iE_q(t_1+t_2)} {}_{\text{out}} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) \pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle. \quad (101)$$

In Euclidean space it is not possible to treat the connected part in this way. Instead of the factor of $\exp(-iE_m t)$, $\mathcal{G}_3$ now has one of $\exp(-E_m t)$ which, at large times t is dominated by $E_m \simeq 2m_\pi$ i.e. the lowest energy state consistent with three-momentum conservation. It is therefore not possible to perform the energy integration by contours.

Appendix B

In this appendix we present a derivation of eq. (84) based on elastic unitarity. The starting point once again is the quantity

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) \equiv \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(t) J(0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (102)$$

defined in eq. (83) of section 6. From the discussion in sec. 2 and appendix A we know that $\mathcal{G}_3$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) &= \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-E_q t} {}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q})\pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \times \left[1 - \frac{i}{2} \mathcal{M}^*(2E_q) \mathcal{N}(2E_q) \right] + \\ &\mathcal{P} \int \frac{dE}{2\pi} \mathcal{N}(E) \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(0) | \pi(\vec{k}) \pi(-\vec{k}) \rangle_{\text{out}}^{\text{conn}} {}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{k})\pi(-\vec{k}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle e^{-(E-E_q)t}, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where the phase space factor $\mathcal{N}(E)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(E) = \frac{k(E)}{4\pi E}, \quad (104)$$

and the scattering amplitude $\mathcal{M}(2E_q) \equiv \mathcal{M}(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}; \vec{q}', -\vec{q}') \ (|q'| = |q|)$ is given by eq. (95)

$$(2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_m - q_1 - q_2) (i \mathcal{M}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2; m)) = {}_{\text{out}}\langle m | \pi(q_1)\pi(q_2) \rangle_{\text{in}} - {}_{\text{out}}\langle m | \pi(q_1)\pi(q_2) \rangle_{\text{out}}. \quad (105)$$

Since J creates a two-pion state of fixed isospin and angular momentum from the vacuum, we have

$${}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q})\pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle = e^{i\delta(2E_q)} \left| {}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q})\pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right|. \quad (106)$$

On the other hand, the elastic scattering amplitude is given, in terms of the scattering phase, by

$$\mathcal{M}(2E_q) = \frac{2}{\mathcal{N}(2E_q)} e^{i\delta(2E_q)} \sin(\delta(2E_q)), \quad (107)$$

and satisfies the unitarity relation

$$2 \text{Im}[\mathcal{M}(2E_q)] = \mathcal{N}(2E_q) \left| \mathcal{M}(2E_q) \right|^2. \quad (108)$$

Using eqs. (106)–(108), we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}_3(t, \vec{q}) = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-E_q t} \left| {}_{\text{out}}\langle \pi(\vec{q})\pi(-\vec{q}) | J(0) | 0 \rangle \right| \cos \delta(2E_q) + \dots, \quad (109)$$

where the ellipses represent the principal value term in eq. (103).

Appendix C

In this appendix we reproduce some of the results of ref. [5] in a form suitable for our presentation. We recall that we are studying the eigenvalue problem for a two particle

system of mass m in the center of mass, subject to a repulsive spherically symmetric potential $V(r)$. For simplicity, we assume that $V(r)$ only gives rise to an s-wave scattering phase shift $\delta(k)$ ⁹, where k denotes the center of mass relative momentum of the two particle system. We also assume that the potential has a finite range R , outside of which it vanishes identically. Our problem is to find the structure of the eigenvalues k^2 and the corresponding eigenfunctions of the Schroedinger equation

$$(\Delta + k^2)\psi(\vec{x}) = mV(r)\psi(\vec{x}) \quad (110)$$

with periodic boundary conditions in a cubic box with sides of length $L > R$. In particular we are interested in the cubically invariant eigenfunctions with non-zero s-wave projections; these are the only ones which can contribute to the sum over intermediate states in eq. (46).

As a result of the hypothesis on the range of the potential, for $R \leq r \leq \frac{L}{2}$, eq. (110) reduces to the Helmholtz equation

$$(\Delta + k^2)\psi(\vec{x}) = 0 . \quad (111)$$

We start by considering the case $k^2 \neq \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\vec{n}^2$, where $\vec{n}$ denotes any vector with integer components. In this case there is no solution which is valid throughout the whole volume.

In order to treat this problem we need the finite volume Green function

$$(\Delta + k^2)G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') = \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') , \quad (112)$$

given by

$$G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{e^{i\vec{p}_n \cdot (\vec{x} - \vec{x}')}}{k^2 - \vec{p}_n^2} , \quad (113)$$

where

$$\vec{p}_n = \frac{2\pi}{L} \vec{n} . \quad (114)$$

It is convenient to consider the expansion of $G_V(\vec{x})$ in spherical harmonics. In particular we will be interested in the spherical projection of $G_V(\vec{x})$

$$G_V^{(0)}(r) \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\Omega} d\Omega \, G_V(\vec{x}) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{1}{k^2 - p_n^2} \frac{\sin p_n r}{p_n r} \quad (115)$$

with $p_n \equiv |\vec{p}_n|$. For $r \neq 0$, $G_V^{(0)}(r)$ satisfies the Helmholtz equation, so that we have

$$G_V^{(0)}(r) = -\frac{\cos kr}{4\pi r} + c \frac{\sin kr}{kr} . \quad (116)$$

⁹For the treatment of the most general case we refer the reader to ref. [5].

The term $-\frac{\cos kr}{4\pi r}$ in eq. (116) by itself satisfies:

$$(\Delta + k^2)\left(-\frac{\cos kr}{4\pi r}\right) = \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') \quad (117)$$

so that the second term on the r.h.s. of eq. (116) must be regular. A possible way to determine c is from the relation

$$c = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{dr} (r G_V^{(0)}(r)) \quad (118)$$

so that eq. (116) gives

$$c = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{\cos p_n r}{k^2 - \vec{p}_n^2} . \quad (119)$$

We add a note of caution at this point. The sum $\frac{1}{V} \sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{1}{k^2 - \vec{p}_n^2}$ is formally the same as $G_V(0)$ and is therefore divergent. The limit in eq. (119) could provide the necessary procedure for the analytic continuation (analogous to s -analytic continuation in ref. [5]). We will not expand further on this point and we note that eq. (116), together with the value of c given in eq. (121) below, coincides with eq.(3.29) in the second paper of ref.[5].

Eq. (119) together with the definition

$$Z_{00}(s, q^2) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \sum_{\{\vec{n}\}} \frac{1}{(\vec{n}^2 - q^2)^s} \quad (120)$$

gives

$$c = -\frac{Z_{00}(1, q^2)}{2\pi^{\frac{3}{2}} L} . \quad (121)$$

When $R \leq r \leq \frac{L}{2}$, the potential is zero and the wave function propagates according to the Helmholtz equation eq. (111). Then, as usual, knowledge of the Green function $G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}')$ implies that

$$\psi(\vec{x}') = \int_{V-S_R} d^3x \, \vec{\partial}_x \cdot [\psi(\vec{x}) \vec{\partial}_x G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') - \vec{\partial}_x \psi(\vec{x}) G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}')] \quad (122)$$

where the integral is extended to the cubic volume with the sphere of radius R subtracted. Using Gauss' theorem and the periodicity in V , we have

$$\psi(\vec{x}') = R^2 \int_{S_R} d\sigma [\psi(\vec{x}) \vec{\partial}_x G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') - \vec{\partial}_x \psi(\vec{x}) G_V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}')] \cdot \vec{n} \quad (123)$$

where $\vec{n}$ is the internal normal to the sphere S_R . $\psi(\vec{x})$ itself is a very complicated object, the superposition of an infinite number contributions from states of different angular momenta.

The quantization condition is that its s-wave projection must coincide with the unperturbed s-wave wave function in infinite volume:

$$f(r) = A \frac{\sin kr}{kr} - B \frac{\cos kr}{kr} \quad (124)$$

where A and B are related to the s-wave phase shift δ by

$$\tan \delta = \frac{B}{A} . \quad (125)$$

Here we have used the condition that only the s-wave component is interacting. In general, the l -th partial wave contributes a radial function:

$$f_l(r) = A_l j_l(kr) + B_l n_l(kr) \quad (126)$$

where $j_l(kr)$ is regular everywhere, while $n_l(kr)$ is singular at the origin and signals the presence of the interaction

$$\tan \delta_l = \frac{B_l}{A_l} . \quad (127)$$

Since we assume that only the s-wave component is interacting, it is only for the s-wave that $B \neq 0$. Now if we set $B_l = 0$ on the r.h.s. of eq. (123), the result must be exactly zero, otherwise we would find regular solutions of the Helmholtz equation with correct boundary conditions, which is impossible if $k^2 \neq \vec{p}_n^2$ for all $\vec{p}_n$. This means that in this case we can put to zero all contributions from states with $l \neq 0$ on the r.h.s. of eq. (123).

Since the only contribution to the r.h.s. of eq. (123) comes from the rotationally invariant component of $\psi(\vec{x})$ and we are interested in the projection of eq. (123) onto the s-wave, we require the angular average of the Green function $G_V^{(0)}(|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|)$ with respect to $\vec{x}$ or $\vec{x}'$:

$$G_V^{(0,0)}(r, r') \equiv \int_{\Omega'} \frac{d\Omega}{4\pi} G_V^{(0)} \left(\sqrt{r^2 + r'^2 - 2rr' \cos \theta} \right) . \quad (128)$$

Evaluation of the integral gives

$$G_V^{(0,0)}(r, r') = \frac{\sin k|r - r'| - \sin k(r + r')}{8\pi krr'} - c \frac{\cos k(r + r') - \cos k(r - r')}{2k^2rr'} . \quad (129)$$

The s-wave projection of eq. (123) then gives rise to the quantization condition

$$f(r) = -4\pi R^2 \left[f(R) \frac{d}{dR} G_V^{(0,0)}(R, r') - f'(R) G_V^{(0,0)}(R, r') \right] \quad \text{with} \quad r' \geq R . \quad (130)$$

After some elementary algebraic manipulations eq. (130) reduces to

$$A \frac{\sin kr}{kr} - B \frac{\cos kr}{kr} = - \frac{B(k \cos kr - 4\pi c \sin kr)}{k^2 r} , \quad (131)$$

from which the Lüscher quantization condition, eq. (9) follows immediately.

The derivation sketched here shows that the Lüscher quantization formula enumerates all the states with $k^2 \neq \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\vec{n}^2$ that have a non-zero projection on the s-wave. These states are non-degenerate, since the final eigenvalue equation has only one solution. There are other eigenstates, not described by eq. (9), which must be considered; these include those with $k^2 = \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\vec{n}^2$ for some $\vec{n}$. These states have an energy which is independent of the interaction because we have assumed that only the s-wave phase shift is non-zero¹⁰. They are constructed as follows. We start with a plane wave of the form $e^{i\vec{p}_n \cdot \vec{x}}$. This is not a solution of eq. (110) because it has an s-wave projection, so that the potential $V(r)$ acts on it in non-trivially. However the combination

$$\tilde{\psi}(\vec{x}) = e^{i\vec{p}_n \cdot \vec{x}} - e^{i\vec{p}'_n \cdot \vec{x}}, \quad (132)$$

where $\vec{p}_n \neq \vec{p}'_n$, but $p_n = p'_n$ is an exact solution of eq. (110) with $k^2 = \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\vec{n}^2$, because it has zero projection on the s-wave. Moreover if $\vec{p}'_n$ is different from the cubic rotations of $\vec{p}_n$, which is possible when $|\vec{n}| \geq 8$, the state in eq. (132) can be averaged to get a cubically invariant eigenstate. However, it is clear from this derivation that these states do not contain an s-wave component and do not therefore contribute to the sum over intermediate states in eq. (46).

There is the further possibility of states corresponding to the eigenvalue $k^2 = \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\vec{n}^2$ and with a non-zero s-wave projection [5]. The condition for the presence of these states can be found using the procedure outlined before. Since the eigenvalue is fixed a priori, the corresponding eigenvalue equation represents a consistency condition in the form of a relation between $\vec{n}^2$, the phase shifts and the volume V . These states therefore are not generic and can only occur for particular volumes and/or potentials and we therefore do not include them in our argument.

We end this appendix by briefly showing that the knowledge of the finite-volume Green function eq. (113) and its projection on a given partial wave (such as the s-wave projection in eq. (116)) allows one to readily reproduce the class of summation formulae given in eq.(2.51) of the second paper of ref. [5]. These formulae are central in computing finite-volume corrections in perturbation theory in quantum mechanics and field theory. For illustration we will discuss the particular case of a spherically symmetrical function $\tilde{f}(p^2)$, for which we prove below that:

$$\frac{1}{V} \sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{\tilde{f}(p_n^2)}{k^2 - p_n^2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3p \frac{\tilde{f}(p^2)}{k^2 - p^2} + c\tilde{f}(k^2) \quad (133)$$

¹⁰In the presence of fully interacting higher partial waves, these states would have a non-trivial quantization condition which could be found by the methods of ref. [5] or by a natural extension of the method presented in this appendix.

up to exponentially small corrections, provided that $f(r)$, the Fourier transform of $\tilde{f}(p^2)$,

$$f(r) \equiv \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3p e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \tilde{f}(p^2) , \quad (134)$$

vanishes exponentially with $r \equiv |\vec{x}|$. In eq. (133) $p_n \equiv |\vec{p}_n|$ and k^2 is different from any of the allowed p_n^2 on the given volume. c is defined in eq. (121) as a function of k^2 and L . To prove eq. (133) we start with the finite-volume integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_V d^3x f(r) G_V(\vec{x}) &= \int_V d^3x f(r) G_V^{(0)}(r) \\ &= \int_V d^3x f(r) \left(-\frac{\cos(kr)}{4\pi r} + c \frac{\sin(kr)}{kr} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

The assumption of the exponential decrease of $f(r)$ at large r allows us to extend the integrals in eq. (135) to infinite volume with an exponentially small error in the volume, so that:

$$\int d^3x f(r) G_V(\vec{x}) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{\tilde{f}(p_n^2)}{k^2 - p_n^2} , \quad (136)$$

$$\int d^3x f(r) \left(-\frac{\cos(kr)}{4\pi r} \right) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3p \frac{\tilde{f}(p^2)}{k^2 - p^2} , \quad (137)$$

$$\int d^3x f(r) \frac{\sin(kr)}{kr} = \tilde{f}(k^2) . \quad (138)$$

This proves eq. (133).

Eq. (133) can also be used in the limit as k^2 approaches one of the p_n^2 , $\vec{K}^2$ say. In this limit both sides of eq. (133) become singular and we can write:

$$\frac{1}{V} \sum'_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{\tilde{f}(p_n^2)}{k^2 - p_n^2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3p \frac{\tilde{f}(p^2)}{k^2 - p^2} + \lim_{k \rightarrow |\vec{K}|} \left\{ c \tilde{f}(k^2) - \frac{\nu_K}{V} \frac{\tilde{f}(K^2)}{k^2 - K^2} \right\} , \quad (139)$$

where, as usual, ν_K is the number of $\vec{p}_n$'s with $p_n^2 = K^2$ and the prime on the summation indicates the omission of the ν_K terms with $p_n^2 = K^2$. From eq. (121) we have that

$$c = \frac{\nu_K}{V} \frac{1}{k^2 - K^2} + c^{\text{reg}} , \quad (140)$$

where c^{reg} is defined as in eq. (121) but with the ν_K terms with $n^2 = n_K^2 \equiv (LK/2\pi)^2$ excluded from the sum in eq. (120). c^{reg} is therefore regular in the limit $k^2 \rightarrow K^2$,

$$\lim_{k^2 \rightarrow K^2} c^{\text{reg}} = -\frac{z_K}{4\pi^2 L} , \quad (141)$$

where the number z_K is defined by

$$z_K \equiv \sum_{\vec{n}^2 \neq n_K^2} \frac{1}{\vec{n}^2 - n_K^2} . \quad (142)$$

Eq. (139) can now be rewritten:

$$\frac{1}{V} \sum'_{\{\vec{p}_n\}} \frac{\tilde{f}(p_n^2)}{K^2 - p_n^2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3p \frac{\tilde{f}(p^2)}{K^2 - p^2} - \frac{z_K}{4\pi^2 L} \tilde{f}(K^2) + \frac{\nu_K}{V} \tilde{f}'(K^2) , \quad (143)$$

where $\tilde{f}'(k^2)$ represents the derivative of $\tilde{f}(k^2)$ with respect to k^2 . Eq. (133) and (143) can be easily extended to functions with an angular dependence and to higher order poles. We stress also that if we take $V \rightarrow \infty$ keeping the physical momentum $\vec{K}$ fixed (by appropriately tuning the sequence of volumes to make this possible) then we must consider n_K , z_K and ν_K to be functions of the volume and therefore the finite-volume corrections are not simply given by the explicit factors of $1/L$ and $1/V$ on the right-hand side of eq. (143).

Appendix D

In this paper we have seen examples of correlation functions from which one can extract the modulus of the amplitude and others from which one can obtain the modulus of the amplitude times $\cos(\delta(2E_q))$. The physical information which can be obtained depends on the correlation function which has been computed. In this final appendix we present one more example, demonstrating that $\cos(\delta(2E_q))$ can be determined directly from the evaluation of four-point correlation functions.

We start with the following correlation function

$$\mathcal{G}_4(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \equiv \langle 0 | \Phi_{\vec{q}}(t_1) \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) \phi^\dagger(\vec{0}, t_3) \phi^\dagger(\vec{0}, t_4) | 0 \rangle , \quad (144)$$

with $t_1 > t_2 > t_3 > t_4$. As before we assume that we can neglect inelastic contributions and that the flavour quantum numbers of the interpolating operators are chosen so as to create two-pion states with a fixed isospin. For large t_1 and large negative t_4 , single-pion states dominate in the time intervals (t_1, t_2) and (t_3, t_4) so that

$$\mathcal{G}_4(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_q} e^{-E_q t_1} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\sqrt{Z}}{2E_k} e^{-E_k |t_4|} \langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) \phi(\vec{0}, t_3) | \pi(\vec{k}) \rangle . \quad (145)$$

Thus we need to consider the matrix element $\langle \pi(\vec{q}) | \Phi_{-\vec{q}}(t_2) \phi(\vec{0}, t_3) | \pi(\vec{k}) \rangle$ to which we apply a similar procedure to that in appendices A and B. Inserting a complete set of

(two-pion) states between the two operators and applying the reduction formulae we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_4(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) &= \frac{Z^2}{4E_q^2} e^{-E_q(t_1+t_2-t_3-t_4)} \left[1 + \frac{i}{2} \mathcal{N}(2E_q) \mathcal{M}(2E_q) \right] \left[1 - \frac{i}{2} \mathcal{N}(2E_q) \mathcal{M}^*(2E_q) \right] \\
&\quad + \text{P.V.} \\
&= \frac{Z^2}{4E_q^2} e^{-E_q(t_1+t_2-t_3-t_4)} \cos^2(\delta(2E_q)) + \text{P.V.} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{146}$$

where P.V. represents the principle value integral over energies other than $2E_q$. Thus from the evaluation of the four-pion correlation function and the determination of the coefficient of the exponential with exponent proportional to E_q we may obtain the cosine of the phase shift directly.

References

- [1] M. Bochicchio et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B262** (1988) B262;
L. Maiani, G. Martinelli, G.C. Rossi and M. Testa, *Phys. Lett.* **176B** (1986) 445 and *Nucl. Phys.* **B289** (1987) 505.
- [2] C. Bernard, T. Draper, G. Hockney and A. Soni, *Nucl. Phys.* **B.Proc.Suppl.** **4** (1988) 483.
- [3] C. Dawson et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B514** (1998) 313.
- [4] L. Lellouch and M. Lüscher, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **219** (2001) 31.
- [5] M. Lüscher, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **104** (1986) 177; *Commun. Math. Phys.* **105** (1986) 153; *Nucl. Phys.* **B354** (1991) 531; *Nucl. Phys.* **B364** (1991) 237.
- [6] L. Maiani and M. Testa, *Phys. Lett.* **B245** (1990) 585.
- [7] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and L. Silvestrini, *Phys. Lett.* **B380** (1996) 353.
- [8] M. Lüscher, unpublished notes, January 2000.
- [9] M. J. Lighthill, *Introduction to Fourier analysis and generalised functions* (Cambridge Univ. Press 1958).
- [10] N. Bleistein, R.A. Handelsman *Asymptotic expansions of integrals* (Dover Editions, 1986).
- [11] W.E. Thirring, *Principles of Quantum Electrodynamics* (Academic Press, New York, London, 1958).

- [12] See for example D. Morgan and M.R. Pennington, in The second Daphne Physics Handbook, edited by L Maiani, G. Pancheri and N. Paver, INFN-LNF.